

REMARKS

Claims 21-48 are pending, but stand rejected. The Examiner has made the rejection final. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

As is explained below, each claim in the present application requires redirection objects or the provision of redirection objects – a limitation not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner in support of the rejections. Each redirection object serves as an indirect link between information objects. In other words, when a browser or other terminal accesses a first information object the browser is presented with a link to a second information object. That link is a link to a redirection object for the second information object. When the link is selected, the browser is directed to the redirection object which redirects the browser to the second information object.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS: Claims 44-48 have been amended to correct an inadvertent error in claim dependency.

SPECIFICATION: The Examiner objected to a typographical error in the specification. That error has been corrected.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103: The Examiner rejected Claims 21-48 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,279,001 issued to DeBettencourt in view of USPN 5,933,596 issued to Mayhew. A requirement for establishing a prima facie case for obviousness is that the cited references must teach or suggest each and every limitation in a rejected claim. Debettencourt and Mayhew fail to teach or suggest one or more limitations in each of Claims 21-48.

The Claims can be divided into three sets – Claims 21-31, Claims 32-42, and Claims 43-48 – with each set having a single independent claim – Claims 21, 32, and 43 respectively. Claim 21 is directed to a method and includes the following limitations.

1. distributing a plurality of information objects across a plurality of servers;
2. providing a redirection object for each information object;

3. wherein each information object includes an indirect link to another information object, each indirect link to an information object being a link to a redirection object for that information object.

Rejecting Claim 21, the Examiner admits that DeBettencourt fails to teach the second and third limitations above but contends that those limitations are taught by Mayhew. To this end, the Examiner cites Mayhew, col. 2, lines 12-45 and col. 4, lines 24-64.

Mayhew teaches the dynamically changing links within web pages to "facilitate load balancing across multiple servers containing the same information." Mayhew, col. 2, lines 38-40 and col. 4, lines 51-58. For example, a user browses to a first page supplied by a first server containing links to other web pages or information normally supplied by the first server but copies of which can be served by one of group of alternate servers. Where it is determined that the first server is busy, the first server alters the links in the web page to refer to copies served by one of the alternate servers. See Mayhew, col. 3, lines 51-58, col. 6, lines 20-54, and Figs. 5A and 5B.

Nothing in Mayhew teaches or suggests providing a redirection object for each information object. Furthermore nothing in Mayhew teaches or suggests distributing information objects where each information object includes an indirect link to another information object that is a link to a redirection object for that information object. For these reasons Claim 21 is felt to distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 22-31 each depend at least indirectly from Claim 21 and include all the limitations of that base claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 21 is patentable, so are claims 22-31.

Claim 32 is directed to a system and includes the following limitations.

1. a plurality of servers, each hosting a different information object;
2. a redirection object for each information object
3. wherein each information object includes an indirect link to another information object, each indirect link to an information object being a link to a redirection object for that information object.

As clarified above, Mayhew fails to teach or suggest a redirection object for each information object. Furthermore nothing in Mayhew teaches or suggests a plurality of servers each hosting a different information object where each information object includes an indirect link to another information object – that indirect link being a link to a redirection object for that information object. For these reasons Claim 32 is felt to distinguish over the cited references. Claims 33-42 each depend at least indirectly from Claim 32 and include all the limitations of that base claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 32 is patentable, so are claims 33-42.

Claim 43 is directed to a method and includes the following limitations


1. hosting a plurality of information web pages on a plurality of distinct web servers;
2. hosting a plurality of redirection web pages on a central web server;
3. wherein each information web page includes an indirect link to another information web page, each indirect link to an information web page being a link to a redirection web page for that information web page.

As clarified above, Mayhew fails to teach or suggest hosting redirection web pages. Furthermore nothing in Mayhew teaches or suggests hosting a plurality of information web pages on distinct web servers where each information web page includes an indirect link to another information web page – that indirect link being a link to a redirection web page for that information web page. For these reasons Claim 43 is felt to distinguish over the cited references. Claims 44-48 each depend at least indirectly from Claim 43 and include all the limitations of that base claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 43 is patentable, so are claims 44-48.

CONCLUSION: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 21-48 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen D. Baker

By 
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

August 16, 2004